

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The following is in response to the Office Action mailed on April 24, 2008.

In the Office Action claims 1-3, 5-8, 12-14, 16-19, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rawat (US Patent No. 6,662,340; herein “Rawat”);

claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat in view of Koseki (US Patent No. 6,732,124; herein “Koseki”);

claims 9, 10, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat in view of Logan (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0093790; herein “Logan”)

By way of the present response claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 20, 21, 26 and 27 have been amended; claims 29-38 have been added. Claims 22 and 23 have been withdrawn. Claims 11 and 24 were previously canceled. Thus claims 1-10, 12-21 and 25-38 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to discuss this application and the Office Action during a telephone interview held on July 21, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12-14, 16-19, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rawat. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Rawat does not clearly disclose each and every element recited in these claims. Rawat discloses a client side program code that fills out fields of forms contained in a document without requiring prior mapping or examination of the form (Rawat, Abstract). This differs from the stated in the application “computer-implemented method for dynamic data type enrichment comprising:

loading an application program into memory, the application program comprising a variable that is defined as an instance of both a basic data type and a specific data type;

accessing metadata at runtime to map the variable to a definition of the specific data type;

dynamically adding the basic data type of the variable with metadata at runtime;
and

processing the variable consistently with the metadata definition of the specific data type;

wherein the application program automatically processes changes in the metadata without incurring changes in a computer system implementing the method.”

Rawat neither teaches “dynamically adding the basic data type of the variable with metadata at runtime”, nor application program which “automatically processes changes in the metadata without incurring changes in a computer system,” as recited in claim 1.

Thus, claims 1 is not anticipated by Rawat. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 12, 26 and 27 have similar limitations as claim 1 and, for at least the reasons stated above, they are all allowable over Rawat. Accordingly, applicant requests that the rejection of claims 12, 26 and 27 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 13, 14, 16-19, 25 and 28 depend directly or indirectly and include all the limitations of one of independent claims 1, 12 and 27. For at least the reasons stated above, claims 2, 3, 5-8, 13, 14, 16-19, 25 and 28 are not anticipated by Rawat.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-8, 13, 14, 16-19, 25 and 28 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat in view of Koseki. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 4 and 15 depend on claims 1 and 12 and include all the limitations of claims 1 and 12. As already discussed, Rawat does not teach at least “dynamically adding the basic data type of the variable with metadata at runtime” and “automatically process[ing] changes in the metadata without incurring changes in a computer system”, as recited in claims 1 and 12. Koseki fails to cure this deficiency of Rawat.

Koseki discloses a data processing system that stores log records to repair a file system (Koseki, Abstract), but fails to teach or suggest “dynamically adding the basic data type of the variable with metadata at runtime” and “automatically process[ing] changes in the metadata without incurring changes in a computer system” (claims 1 and 12).

Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 4 and 15 are patentable over Rawat in view of Koseki. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that claims 4 and 15 be allowed.

Claims 9, 10, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat in view of Logan. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 9, 10, 20 and 21 depend on claims 1 and 12 and include all the limitations of claims 1 and 12. As already discussed, Rawat does not teach at least “dynamically adding the basic data type of the variable with metadata at runtime” and “automatically process[ing] changes in the metadata without incurring changes in a computer system”, as recited in claims 1 and 12. Logan fails to cure this deficiency of Rawat.

Logan discloses a system for utilizing metadata to enhance user’s enjoyment of broadcast programming content (Logan, Abstract) but fails to teach and suggest “dynamically adding the basic data type of the variable with metadata at runtime” and “automatically process[ing] changes in the metadata without incurring changes in a computer system” (claims 1 and 12).

Logan also fails to teach storing metadata in a private instance “such that a user can perform actions leading to changes in the metadata without impacting other users of the application”, (claims 9 and 20), or storing metadata in a shared instance “such that a user can introduce changes in the metadata that affect all users of the application program”, (claims 10 and 21).

Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 9, 10, 20 and 21 are patentable over Rawat in view of Logan. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that claims 9, 10, 20 and 21 be allowed

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, Examiner is invited to contact.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 25, 2008

/Ronald C. Card/

Ronald C. Card,

Registration No. 44,587